Morse's Neglected Warning Against A Wider War in Asia, P. 3

Carry The Fight to North Vietnam? Hard Enough to Make Them Fight in The South

"Recent talk about sending South Vietnamese raiding parties into Communist North Vietnam is shrugged off by veteran U.S. advisers here. 'We have trouble enough getting the troops to fight in the south,' says one. 'What makes the Pentagon think they will do any better up north.' . . . In one typical week last week the U.S. military headquarters here tallied 2,800 actions by small government patrols. But only 3% of these made any contact with the enemy. . . . One day last month an L-D spotter plane reported seeing a band of guerrillas. A South Vietnamese army unit was nearby, and a U.S. adviser urged it to close in on the Reds. Instead the Vietnamese commander called for rocket-firing U.S. Army helicopters. Five of the aircraft, each valued at $250,000, were sent in to do battle with at most a half dozen enemy soldiers."

—Wall St. Journal dispatch from Saigon, Mar. 6.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XII, NO. 11 MARCH 16, 1964 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

When A Nation's Leaders Fear to Tell the Truth

Our emissary to Saigon, Secretary McNamara, seems to be as confused as he is confusing on the subject of the war in Vietnam. In January he made a statement which led people to believe that the U.S. was committed to total victory at any cost in that area. In his annual military posture statement Jan. 27 to House Armed Services Committee he said "the survival of an independent government in South Vietnam is so important to the security of all southeast Asia and to the free world that I can conceive of no alternative other than to take all necessary measures within our capability to prevent a Communist victory." This led many to believe that the U.S. was ready to extend the war in order to win.

Our "Options" Seen as Dangerous

But under questioning by the committee in closed session, he took a very different position. Unfortunately this was not released until Feb. 18 and was buried in more than 1,000 pages of testimony. The first time the matter came up was when Congressman Stratton *(D. N.Y.)* asked him, "Wouldn't you say that in the event that things do not go as well as you hope they will, that unquestionably we can't continue to withdraw any more of our forces?" This elicited a surprising answer. "No, sir; I would not," McNamara replied, "I don't believe that we as a nation should assume the primary responsibility for the war in South Vietnam. It is a counter-guerrilla war, it is a war that can only be won by the Vietnamese themselves." When Congressman Cohelan *(D. Cal.)* said he wanted to be sure "we are very conscious of other options that we might have to exercise if things were not going quite the way we want it," the Secretary answered, "It is the unsatisfactory character of most of those other options that leads me personally to conclude we should continue our program in South Vietnam." Among the other "options" of course is to widen the war by an attack on North Vietnam which might bring the Chinese in.

Later Congressman Pike *(D. N.Y.)* said he was "concerned with what I think to be a conflict between what we say about the importance of this area and what we actually propose to do about it." McNamara replied, "Well, I think they are in agreement and it goes back to the point I made earlier, that only the Vietnamese can win this war." He said it wasn't "artillery shells but the confidence of the peasants" that would "ultimately determine the outcome of the war" and he added that "doubling our military aid would not, in my opinion, substantially increase the effectiveness of their military operations." The question was raised again and elicited an even clearer answer later in these closed hearings:

Mr. LONG (D. Md.): If the Vietnamese war goes very badly, do you contemplate another Korean war from our point of view, our pouring in hundreds of thousands of troops?

Secretary McNAMARA: No, sir.

Mr. LONG: You mentioned before that this is an area we must hold at all costs?

Secretary McNAMARA: I don't believe that pouring in hundreds of thousands of troops is the solution to the problem in Vietnam.

These answers were supplemented by an even more sober reply from Army Chief of Staff General Wheeler to Mr. Becker *(R. N.Y.)*. "It would seem to me," Mr. Becker said, "that in South Vietnam, and through North Vietnam and these other areas they [the Chinese] can *keep sending them in for years* (italics added), and eventually the South Vietnamese, no matter how much they may desire to save their own country, eventually are going to be weakened to the point where they can no longer do it." The basic fallacy

(Continued on Page Four)

What McNamara's Computers Miss

"Most of the Vietnamese do not really care about the war; most of them do not want to fight. Under the circumstances this is understandable. There are numerous families in Vietnam without homes, and without a job. Even in Saigon there are people sleeping in doorways and on the sidewalks and begging for food. . . . In combat, when the Vietnamese do have a chance to fire on the Vietcong, quite often they refuse.

"There are some people who are profiting from this war. I have never seen so many colonels and generals in one place in all my life. They are living here at government expense, in beautiful villas with two or three servants per household. I have talked to so many who do not even want to go home because they could not afford such luxuries at home."

—Letter from the wife of a serviceman in Vietnam to Senator Young (D. Ohio) Con. Rec. Mar. 3.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

$300,000 Appropriation Moved to Floor Without Advance Warning to Avoid Debate

House Leadership Pulls A Fast One to Help the Un-Americans

In a surprise move that caught every abolitionist but one outside the chamber, the House March 4 authorized a whopping $300,000 for its Un-American Activities Committee. The authorizing resolution, $60,000 less than last year's, was brought to the floor only one hour after the Committee on House Administration had approved it. James Roosevelt *(D. Cal.)* inquired if "it was necessary to shroud this matter in such secrecy . . . because some Members may be ashamed of it." Whatever the reason, trickery of this kind is predictable and the liberals should have been prepared for it.

Burton Blocks Unanimous Consent

The measure would have passed by unanimous consent had it not been for the objection of freshman Congressman Phillip Burton *(D. Cal.)*. This was a fitting congressional debut for Burton. For eight years as a California State legislator he defended civil liberties against loyalty oaths and witch hunts. Last month, running against seven other candidates, he won his congressional seat by a majority of votes on a platform that included medicare for all citizens, conversion from defense to public works, trade with Red China, and abolition of HUAC. His San Francisco district with 15% unemployed is one of the most depressed urban areas in the country. Is Burton the first of many dissident voices that automation will bring to Congress?

Two fine anti-HUAC speeches, one by Ryan *(D. N.Y.)* and one by Farbstein *(D. N.Y.)*, also helped to redeem the liberals. Ryan deflated the committee with ridicule. He said only twenty-six of the almost 10,000 public bills introduced into the House last year were referred to the committee and yet it maintained a 61-member staff, the third largest in the House. Eleven of the twenty-six bills have been around for years. In its 26-year history the committee has been responsible for only three laws, including one to correct an error it made in writing the Internal Security Act.

The committee's main event in 1963 was to investigate travel to Cuba and pro-Castro activities in the United States. Hearings ran for more than six months, included forty-two witnesses and produced four publications totaling 632 pages. Ryan pointed out that when the chairman finally introduced a bill to ban travel to specific countries, it was appropriately referred to another committee, Judiciary.

However easy to ridicule, the committee remains a powerful instrument in the hands of racists and cold warriors. In the *New York Times* Feb. 17, Claude Sitton reported that the committee's files were being used to intimidate white integrationists in Alabama. This isn't the first time denial of civil liberties has been used against civil rights. In 1958 Chairman Walter took his red-hunters to Atlanta to slander white radicals and liberals active in the Negro cause.

Itself sustained by the cold war, the committee speaks for those who oppose peaceful accommodation and villify all who seek it. Rep. Farbstein recalled the letter the committee circulated among Senators during the test ban debate. The committee, referring to the lobbying activities of Women Strike for Peace, wrote that "excessive concern with peace . . . prevents adequate defense, hinders effective diplomacy, undermines the will to resist and saps national strength." Farbstein warned that if we are "to avoid a perilous future . . . we cannot cheaply dismiss any individual or any group of citizens by a slur on their motives." It remains the committee's one virtue to reveal more clearly than any critic the distance between us and a wholly free society.

When Injustice Is Not Unjust

In the Yellin case last year the Supreme Court for the first time reversed a conviction for contempt of the Un-American Activities Committee on the ground that it had failed to abide by its Rule IV which provides for executive sessions where a public hearing might "unjustly" injure the reputation of a witness. Judge Luther W. Youngdahl followed Yellin last week in reversing the contempt conviction of Bernard Silber who, like Yellin, had asked a private hearing. In reversing the contempt conviction of Frank Grumman, the Judge went a step further. Grumman had made no request for a private hearing before being called in public. Judge Youngdahl put the burden on the Committee to obey its own rules. He cited as an "improper" standard testimony by Richard Arens, then its staff director, to the effect that if the Committee knew a witness would be unfriendly it called him in public because then any injury to his reputation would not be "unjust"! Both Silber and Grumman were members of the American Communications Association.

Keating Protests Eastland's Seizure of Southern Conference Records

"I understand that the records of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc., were subpoenaed October 5 at your discretion. I understand further that they were transferred to Mississippi October 27, ten days after a request by officials of the SCEF in the Louisiana Criminal District Court for a permanent injunction to bar removal of these records from the area.

"I further understand that on November 14 some members of the Internal Security Subcommittee approved a resolution to incorporate portions of this material by reference into the hearing record and to photostat it in full before returning it. That resolution was not brought to my attention until my staff specifically inquired January 27.

"I would therefore like to take this occasion to express my deep concern over the action taken. First, I question what federal legislative purpose is served by the subpoenaing of material already under review by a committee of a state legislature. Secondly, I am very much opposed to the subpoena of any records that are material to pending litigation in a state court. This strikes me as a startling violation of states' as well as individual rights.

"Thirdly, I am disturbed that, although a member of the subcommittee which has, in effect, ratified this action, I was not informed of this action or given any opportunity to express my dissent.

"Regardless of the nature of the group involved in this case, I believe the action taken by the subcommittee is most unfortunate and I strongly urge that no further actions be undertaken by the committee along these or similar lines without full discussion by the entire subcommittee."

—Letter from Sen. Keating (R. N.Y.) to Sen. Eastland (D. Miss.), Chairman of Senate Judiciary Committee.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One Day After Rusk's Secret Briefing on Vietnam, Morse Discloses Danger Ahead

An Expanded War in Asia Could Only Be Won If We Used Nuclear Arms

By Senator Wayne Morse *

When one looks at a map, and at the central position China occupies in relation to all the countries which frame the Indian Ocean, the China Sea and the Pacific Ocean, it is evident that it is China that is going to dominate Asia whether the United States likes it or not, and no matter what we choose to do about it.

As I said to the Secretary of State in the Foreign Relations Committee yesterday, those troops [in Vietnam] should be brought home. They never should have been sent there in the first place. American unilateral participation in the war of South Vietnam cannot be justified, and will not be justified in American history. As I have made clear to the State Department, this administration had better be warned now that when the casualty lists of American boys in South Vietnam increase until the mothers and fathers of those boys start crying "Murder," no administration will stand.

Southeast Asia Not Essential To Our Defense

We must keep in mind the fact that we have always considered southeast Asia to be beyond the perimeter of U.S. defense. Southeast Asia is not essential to U.S. defense.

China is the whole interior of the world's largest land mass. We are interested in preserving its fringes as U.S. footholds. That is as futile an effort as this country will ever embark upon. The concept of the Pacific as an American lake was possible only at the close of World War II when Japan lay temporarily prostrate.

It is not beyond the realm of possibility that China will embark upon the kind of aggression that Imperial Japan embarked on in the 1930's and 1940's, futilely seeking an outlet for her population and for her ideological designs. But that is a contingency that the United States cannot possibly prevent with foreign aid programs, military missions, by "showing the flag" with a few ships or even 15,000 troops.

I am completely opposed to increasing the scale of our participation in the Vietnamese war. I am opposed to it because American involvement in any Asian conflict is going to be nuclear involvement. I am satisfied that there is no other way this country could meet the manpower and geographic advantages that a Chinese-backed force would have. *I am permitted to say, within the bounds of secrecy and in my capacity as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee who individually has passed a judgment upon American foreign policy in Asia, that we cannot win a land war in Asia with American conventional ground forces.* (Italics added.) That is fully recognized by outstanding military experts.

I listened yesterday to a briefing by the Secretary of State, which gave rise to this speech today. I say to the American people they have a right to a clarification of American foreign policy in Asia. They have a right to know what the plans of this government are in respect to Vietnam.

I am satisfied that this country would make the gravest mistake of its history by carrying a war, nuclear or otherwise, onto the mainland of Asia. What we might do if we were attacked was answered in World War II; but today we have not been attacked by any Asian country. Our responsibilities toward South Vietnam are no more than those of every other member of the South East Asia Treaty Organization. What joint policy has been worked out with these SEATO members for action in Vietnam? None.

The South Vietnamese government toward which we have exercised these unilateral policies is little more than our own creation. We constructed a government there in 1954, which we then propped up with huge amounts of aid and which we say invited American troops. The rationalization that our Government gives for American troops being in South Vietnam is that the South Vietnam government invited them in. But control of the South Vietnam government has been passed around within the American-financed governing clique until its association with U.S. support is closer than its association with the people of Vietnam.

* **Abridged from a speech in the U.S. Senate March 4 which the press largely ignored.**

New Policy Needed for A New World

"The world has moved beyond World War II. It is beginning to move beyond the cold war. When are the foreign and military policies of the United States going to move beyond World War II and the cold war? When will the United States develop a foreign and defense policy that will recognize that every event everywhere is not vital to us, and that even if it were, we could not put out enough money and manpower to control all these events?

"That is the foreign policy challenge that faces this administration. It is a challenge for a post-cold war, missile age international policy. It must take into account the breakup of the two dominant world blocs, and the technological changes that have bypassed the need for far-flung bases of the kind that were once needed to carry conventional war to two continents outside the Western Hemisphere."

—Morse (D. Ore.) in the Senate, Mar. 4 (abridged).

India and Pakistan Only Taking U.S. Military Aid to War on Each Other

"CENTO does not exist for all practical political purposes, and Pakistan has belonged to it for only one reason —the U.S. aid she could get out of it. I have come to the conclusion that there never was a time when Pakistan would have fulfilled her CENTO obligations vis-a-vis Russia. And even the most obtuse must realize by now that Pakistan's membership in SEATO is rendered totally meaningless by her close ties with China.

"Pakistan has belonged to those organizations for one purpose only—to get military aid from the United States that would build her forces against her one avowed enemy —India. Not only does the United States not have any quarrel with India, but we have recently undertaken an expanded military aid program to India, which I believe is a mistake equal only to our heavy aid to Pakistan.

"India and Pakistan will string along American military men and AID officials to keep them happy, to keep guns and money coming, but they are going to put our aid to work strictly for their own purposes and not for ours."

—Morse (D. Ore.) in the Senate, Mar. 4 (abridged).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So Long As Rusk and McNamara Continue to Propagate Delusions

(Continued from Page One)

here lies in the words we have italicized. It is that the South Vietnamese war is an invasion, somehow run by the Chinese, when it is actually a rebellion by the South Vietnamese themselves. This was implicit in General Wheeler's reply:

If we can ever get the Government leaders of South Vietnam in control of their territory and their own people —that is if the Government leaders identify themselves to the people as being the protectors of the population, advancing their interests politically, economically, sociologically and every other way—there won't be any way for the enemy to infiltrate, because guerrillas have to live among the people. Guerrillas can't survive unless the people hide them. Mao Tse-tung has a thesis that goes something like this—guerrillas hide among the population as the fish hide in the sea. This is a very true adage. Now, as I say, if the South Vietnamese government can ever achieve this degree of control of their own territory and people, you will have no guerrilla problem. There will be a threat and this will be the threat of the regular North Vietnamese forces, backed by the Chinese. However this is an entirely different problem than the one we are faced with today.

The Army Took The Same View in 1954

This clear-sighted view is characteristic of the Army. Gen. Wheeler's predecessor as Chief of Staff, Gen. Ridgeway, threw his weight on similar grounds against intervention in the same area when it was advocated by Dulles, Nixon and Radford in 1954. Unfortunately this realistic estimate was given in closed hearings and is buried in a voluminous record. It is out of harmony with the demonological views impressed on American thinking by cold war propaganda. This has led us to see the Vietnamese uprising simply as a Communist plot, and Communism as an occult conspiracy with magical powers whereby a handful of infiltrating agitators can "infect" a whole population with Marxism-Leninism though these same natives can barely read the directions on a can of soup. It then seems logical to infer that this infection (like witchcraft) can only be stopped by burning out its source in Peking whence these diabolic subversives fan out like a corps of Fausts to seduce all these maiden minds.

The basic problem is not in Vietnam but in the USA. So long as these melodramatic nightmares color so much of American political thinking, there will be demands for extension of the war, though we can smash all North Vietnam and China with nuclear bombs without making the peasants in the Mekong Valley any more content with the corrupt and repressive governments we have maintained in power over them. This is no doubt what Secretary Rusk meant when he said cryptically Feb. 27 that "no miracle" in the North would solve the problem in the South. But such remarks are made *sotto voce*. Into the headlines which mold the public mind Rusk and McNamara continue to pour a picture of the conflict as an invasion from the North, supplied by arms from China. So long as they fear to tell the truth about the war, they cannot free themselves from the undertow pulling them toward its suicidal extension.

An Ambiguous Victory

Every newspaperman will be grateful that the Supreme Court has unanimously reversed the $500,000 verdict won by a Montgomery, Ala., police commissioner against the New York Times and four Negro ministers who signed a protest ad in it. While the case has been remanded, the review of the evidence in the opinion and the standards established make it unlikely that this suit will be renewed. But what of 11 other suits by Southern officials against the New York Times and five other suits against CBS for a grand total of $7,730,000—and what of the future? The decision held that "actual malice" must be proven and that the burden of proof is on the official bringing the suit where he claims a libel in "an otherwise impersonal attack on government operations." But what if the official is attacked by name, as was not the case in this New York Times ad? In effect the press and radio-TV are left at the mercy of Southern juries and the gamble of how the appellate courts review their findings of fact. The Anglo-American press struggled for centuries to free itself from the old common law which made criticism of public officials punishable as civil, criminal or seditious libel. Justices Black, Douglas and Goldberg protested that the First Amendment right to criticize public officials should not be made dependent as Goldberg said "upon the probing by the jury of the motivation of the citizen or press." The fear of long and costly litigation under this new ruling may serve to inhibit reporting about the South.

Free Copies of This or Any Other Issue Mailed Free to Friends If You Send Stamped Self-Addressed Envelope and Specify Which Issue

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

3/16/64

For this additional $5.35 please send a copy of I. F. Stone's "The Haunted Fifties."

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

Newspaper

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except in August at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED